



RECEIVED

SEP 2 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

GROUP 3600

In re Application of: Michael J. Dove

Serial No.: 10/053,192

Filed: January 23, 2002

For: **TELESCOPING EXTENSION POLE WITH
BUILT-IN TUBE END PROTECTION**

Group Art Unit: 3676

Examiner: Williams, Mark A.

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

This communication is in response to the Final Office Action mailed May 21, 2004.

Please find applicable section amendments for the above-referenced application on separately attached sheets.

Applicant respectfully requests that the proposed amendment presented herein be entered by the Examiner. Applicant understands that the Examiner may permit such after Final Rejection Amendments upon "a showing of good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and were not earlier presented." (37 CFR §1.116) In this regard, Applicant believes that the amendments contained herein do not present new issues requiring further consideration or search by the examiner, but merely clarify that which distinguishes Applicant's invention over the prior art.

The First Office Action and Applicant's subsequent response were primarily directed to the numerous informalities that existed in Applicant's original specification including the drawings

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450, on the date shown below.

Michael J. Dove

Date

8/23/04

and claims. In that Office Action, Applicant was graciously provided with a guideline illustrating the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. Only upon review of the Examiner's detailed rejections contained in this Final Office Action did Applicant understand and appreciate the Examiner's rejections and point of view regarding the prior art, and was able to more clearly define the claims so as to distinguish Applicant's invention over the prior art.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that only a cursory review of the remarks and amendments contained herein are necessary by the Examiner to conclude that the application is now in condition for allowance.